



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/032,709

10/24/2001

Michael A. Tavis

M1103.70273US00

5403

45840

7590

04/06/2006

WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation)
C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/032,709

Applicant(s)

TAVIS ET AL.

Examiner

Asghar Bilgrami

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 states on line 2 “the apparatus comprising: an activity adapted to implement a portion of a collaboration session, the activity generating an update request in response to an action by user within the session; the claim language is unclear in term of pointing out the subcomponent of the apparatus where this activity is taking place.

3. Claim 32 is also rejected under the same circumstances.

4. Claims 1 & 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: The examiner advises the applicant to clearly show each subcomponent along with its functionality and interconnection with other subcomponents that are part of the apparatus for managing software component update.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell (U.S. 6826600 B1) and Parthesarathy et al (U.S. 6,353,926 B1).

7. As per claims 1, 11, 21, 31 & 32 Russell disclosed apparatus for managing a software component update on a computer system with a memory the apparatus comprising: an activity adapted to implement a portion of a collaboration session, the activity generating an update request in response to an action by user within the session (col.1, lines 49-67 & col.2, lines 1-37); a component manager that receives the request, and has a parser that extracts from the request URL information which identifies the location of a file containing software component resources for satisfying the request (col.11, lines 39-67). However Russell did not explicitly disclose a download manager that receives the URL information from the component manager and has a file retriever which asynchronously retrieves the file from the specified location, places the file in a staging area in the memory; and an install manager that asynchronously install the file. In the same field of endeavor Parthesarathy disclosed a download manager that receives the URL information from the component manager and has a file retriever which asynchronously retrieves the file from the specified location, places the file in a staging area in the memory and

Art Unit: 2143

notifies the component manager; and an install manager that is instructed by the component manager to asynchronously install the file in the staging area (col.5, lines 61-67 & col.6, lines 1-13 & lines 14-31).

It would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated a component manager asynchronously retrieving file from a specified location as disclosed by Parthesarathy into an apparatus for managing software component update as disclosed by Russell in order to provide the software/data transfer in a more efficient and secure manner and as a result make the software component apparatus more stable and prone to unauthorized users.

8. As per claims 2, 12, 22 & 33 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the file contains an OSD description of the software component resources (Parthesarathy, col.6, lines 33-59).

9. As per claims 3, 13, 23 & 34 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the component manager comprises a security section that validates the file before installation (Parthesarathy, col.8, lines 53-65).

10. As per claims 4, 14, 24 & 35 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 further comprises a manifest contains a list of all software components installed on the computer system (Russell, col.18, lines 48-65).

11. As per claims 5, 15, 25 & 36 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 4 wherein the component manager comprises a mechanism that responds to the request by checking the manifest to ascertain whether the requested software component is already installed on the computer system (Russell, col.18, lines 66-67 & col.19, lines 1-27).

12. As per claims 6, 16, 26 & 37 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the component manager comprising a polling mechanism that periodically polls component locations to locate new component version (Parthesarathy, col.5, lines 61-67 & col.6, lines 1-10).

13. As per claims 7, 17, 27 & 38 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the software component may be a system component that is required for operation of the apparatus or an application component that is not required for operation of the apparatus and wherein the apparatus further comprises a system component manager that receives a request for the system component and a system component installer that is started by the system component manager (Parthesarathy, col.5, lines 61-67 & col.6, lines 1-67) .

14. As per claims 8, 18, 28 & 39 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the activity generates the update request in response to receiving an invitation for a user to join the collaboration session, the invitation being generated in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session (Russell, col.18, lines 66-67 & col.19, lines 1-27).

15. As per claims 9, 19, 29 & 40 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the activity generates the update request in response to receiving an update delta for the collaboration session, the update delta being generated in response to an action by a user within the collaboration session. (Russell, col.18, lines 66-67 & col.19, lines 1-27).

16. As per claims 10, 20, 30 & 41 Russell -Parthesarathy disclosed the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the component manager comprises an activation factory for activating installed software components (Russell, col.20).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed 01/25/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

18. Claims as amended by the appliance have been anticipated by the introduction of new art, see rejection.

Conclusion

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asghar Bilgrami whose telephone number is 571-272-3907. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



AB

Asghar Bilgrami
Examiner
Art Unit 2143



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100